

we understand from history: nobody is going to ever conquer Afghanistan. So, therefore, I hope the President will stay to his word and start bringing our troops home.

We are spending \$8 billion a month in Afghanistan, and yet throughout America, including my district, the Third Congressional District of North Carolina, we can't even fix the roads. We can't even fix the schools because we are spending money we don't have that we are borrowing from the Japanese, the Chinese, UAE and other countries.

It is time that this Congress speaks up and listens: 63 percent of the American people say it is time to get out of Afghanistan. So I hope that the President will speak tomorrow night about Afghanistan. I hope he will say that he intends to start bringing our troops home this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have here photographs of marines from the Camp Lejeune area, which is in my district. They are young, anywhere from 19 to 38 years of age, who have given their life for this country. And yet many times I wonder here in Congress why don't we bring up this issue of bringing our troops home from Afghanistan.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to thank you for giving me this chance to speak. I want to thank those who are on the floor, I hope you join us, RON PAUL and myself and JIMMY DUNCAN on our side, who have been saying that it is time to bring our troops home. Let's join together in a bipartisan way and start talking about bringing our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, as I do each and every night, as I think about the pain that I have seen at Walter Reed and Bethesda, I think about the families who are burying their loved ones now who have died in Afghanistan, that it is time to say to God, God please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families. God, in Your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child, dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

□ 1920

God, please continue to bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in Your eyes for Your people.

God, give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in Your eyes for Your people.

And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

#### SMART SECURITY: INCREASE DEVELOPMENT AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it's not often that you'll hear me, LYNN WOOLSEY, say this, but I have recently found myself on the same page of a very im-

portant issue, at least in principle, with the leaders of the tea party movement and other top lawmakers on the other side of the aisle.

They've said that the military budget must be on the table in any discussion about reducing Federal spending. I agree. I agree completely. The Progressive Caucus has for several years offered specific cuts that would in no way impact our ability to provide for the national defense but that would actually cut the Pentagon spending. Here is the problem, Mr. Speaker:

When it came time for the rubber to meet the road, well, guess what happened. The Republican Study Group released their list of cuts last week, and lo and behold, not a single dime of actual Pentagon cuts was in there.

What was included were irresponsible cuts to public housing, high-speed rail and economic development, among other things, to say nothing of what would happen to funding for national parks, Pell Grants and NIH, if they followed through with their plans to cut non-defense discretionary spending to what they recommend—to 2006 levels. But perhaps the most reckless of all was the proposal to zero out funding for USAID, the United States Agency for International Development.

It just goes to show the narrowness of their perspective when it comes to national security. When they think about protecting America, they think only of weapons and warfare. In fact, that's the approach our policymakers have taken for the last decade in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it has cost us nearly 6,000 American lives, plus more than \$1 trillion of the people's money, while doing next to nothing to defeat the terrorist threat.

What we need instead is a SMART Security policy, with humanitarian aid like the kind distributed by USAID as a centerpiece. Instead of a military surge, we need a civilian surge. Wherever there is poverty and deprivation around the world, we need to be there with assistance that promotes stability and keeps terrorism from taking root in the first place. I'm talking about everything from debt relief to democracy promotion, to human rights, to sustainable development, to education, especially including education for women and girls.

Mr. Speaker, development aid gives the taxpayer plenty of bang for the buck, and it actually costs pennies on the dollar. It represents a microscopic portion of the Federal budget. Yet development aid has great influence when it comes to creating the conditions for global stability and global peace.

If we are serious about national security in the 21st century, if we are serious about projecting moral authority and honoring American values, then we must dramatically increase humanitarian aid, and we must not cut it. If we are serious about deficit reduction, it is time to address the real waste and excess—the Pentagon—which has enjoyed a blank check for far too long.

So I applaud the majority if they are truly prepared to cut military spending; but so far, I hear more talking points than serious proposals. I have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it is all talk until it is not, and if the majority party wants to do something that would advance our security goals while dramatically reining in Federal spending, then they should join me in a call to immediately bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

#### THE RUNAWAY FEDERAL RESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks, there have been several articles published by officials from the Federal Reserve system. This is a little bit unusual because they are critical of anybody who criticizes them and are critical of me in particular. In these articles, they are trying to discredit anybody who disagrees with their policies, and they are very defensive of this.

They have argued the case that they should have total secrecy. In this total secrecy, I claim they have tremendous power to do the things that they want to do, and it has only been recently that the American people and this Congress have awakened to this. Although we did not get a full audit of the Fed last year, we did get a partial audit of the emergency funding, but still the Fed's argument is they have to have total independency while the American people believe there should be transparency.

The Fed's argument is that they literally are the saviors of the economy, that they came in as an emergency when the markets were crashing, and that they were able to rescue the entire world economy by their injection of hundreds of billions, if not trillions, of dollars.

The fallacy of all this is that they may have rescued some banks and that they may have rescued some big businesses, but they didn't rescue the American people. The consequence of all this has been high unemployment, people losing their houses, and people who can't pay their mortgages.

So, in their claim that they prevented a deep depression, they prevented a depression for some very wealthy, well-connected people on Wall Street, who were making a lot of money anyway in the bubble period of time. Now the people who are suffering the most are the average people, who have had to suffer the consequence of the Federal Reserve policies. This is a policy that punishes the innocent people and that actually rewards the guilty people and the people who were the beneficiaries.

You know, the very people who are claiming that they have solved all of our problems are the very ones who created the problems, and they never